

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of	Examiner: Mary C. Hoffman
Edward Draper	Group Art Unit: 3733
Serial No.: 10/675,855	Confirmation No.: 3955
Filed: September 25, 2003	Customer No.: 81154
TITLE: BONE FIXATED, ARTICULATED JOINT LOAD CONTROL DEVICE	Date: June 30, 2009

---

AMENDMENT AND INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper is being filed in response to the Office Action dated June 15, 2009. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for participating in the interview held on June 30, 2009. During the interview, the phrases and terms “relatively full mobility,” “in-line” and “non-sliding” were discussed. It was agreed that the Section 112 rejection of claim 1 would be overcome upon the Applicant explaining in the Remarks section of the present paper that the phrase “relatively full mobility” essentially means “substantially full mobility” and encompasses not clinically hampering the angular displacement of a joint. It was also agreed that amending the specification to support the terms “in-line” and “non-sliding,” without adding new matter, would operate to obviate the objection to the specification and the Section 112 rejection of claim 38. Please amend the above-referenced application as indicated below.